Dédié à la mémoire du professeur R. I. Avanesov, membre correspondant de l'Akademija Nauk SSSR, ancien-vice-président de l'ALE

ATLAS LINGUARUM EUROPAE (ALE)

sous la rédaction de

Mario Alinei, président;
A. Weijnen, ancien-président;
R. I. Avanesov†, Terho Itkonen et Mieczysław Szymczak, vice-présidents;

Jacques Allières, Manuel Alvar, Poul Andersen, Manuela Barros-Ferreira, Jaromír Bělič†, Dalibor Brozović, Boris Cazacu, David Clement, Nicolas Contossopoulos, Manlio Cortelazzo, László Deme, Witold Doroszewski†, Inger Ejskjær, Lennart Elmevik, T. V. Gamkrelidze, Jan Goossens, Corrado Grassi, Rudolf Grosse, Klaas Heeroma†, Reiner Hildebrandt, V. V. Ivanov, Pavle Ivić, G. A. Klimov, F. Kortlandt, A. Kostallari, Wolfgang Putschke, Ernest Schüle, B. A. Serebrennikov, E. R. Tenichev, Gaston Tuaillon, J. D. A. Widdowson et Werner Winter;

Joep Kruijsen, secrétaire de la rédaction.

VOLUME I – COMMENTAIRES

premier fascicule

par

Mario Alinei, R. I. Avanesov†, D. Brozović, Natacha Z. Donadze, Terho Itkonen, V. V. Ivanov, Joep Kruijsen, Ellen Mooijman, João Saramago, B. A. Serebrennikov, I. Stan, G. Tuaillon, Gabriela Vitorino et A. Weijnen.

sous les auspices de l'UNESCO

VAN GORCUM, ASSEN, 1983

© 1983, Van Gorcum & Comp. B.V., P.B. 43, Assen, Pays-Bas/The Netherlands

Tous droits réservés

No parts of this book may be reproduced in any form, by print, photoprint, microfilm or any other means without written permission from the publisher.

CIP-gegevens

Atlas

Atlas Linguarum Europae (ALE) / sous la red. de Mario Alinei . . . [et al.]. – Assen: Van Gorcum
Vol. I: Commentaires: premier fascicule / Mario Alinei . . . [et al.]
Uitg. onder auspiciën van de UNESCO. – Met lit. opg., reg.
SISO 801.1 UDC 802
Trefw.: taalkunde; Europa

ISBN 90-232-2034-X

Cette publication a été préparée
avec le concours financier de l'UNESCO, sur la recommandation du Comité International Permanent des Linguistes (CIPL) et sous les auspices du Conseil International de la Philosophie et des Sciences Humaines (CIPSH);
sous les auspices de l'Union Académique Internationale;
avec le soutien financier de l'Organisation Néerlandaise pour le Développement de la Recherche Scientifique (ZWO);
avec le soutien financier de la Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG), sur la recommandation du Forschungsinstitut für deutsche Sprache, deutscher Sprachatlas de Marburg

La couverture représente la première carte linguistique européenne. Elle a été dessinée par le Hollandais Lambert ten Kate Hermansz, et publiée en 1723 à Amsterdam, dans: Aenleiding tot de Kennisse van het Verheevene Deel der Nederduitsche Sprake, waarin hare zekerste Grondslag, edelste Kraght, nuttelijkste Onderscheiding en geregeldste Afleiding overwogen en naegespoort, en tegen het Allervoornaemste der Verouderde en Nog-levende Taelverwanten, als 't Oude Moeso-Gothisch, Frank-Duitsch en Angel-Saxisch beneffens het Hedendaegsche Hoog-Duitsch en Yslandsch vergeleken word, door Lambert ten Kate Hermansz., Amsterdam, Rudolf en Gerard Wetstein, 1723.

Imprimé par Van Gorcum, Assen

Printed in The Netherlands by Van Gorcum, Assen

COMITÉS NATIONAUX DE L'ALE

Albanie	A. Kostallari (prés.)	L. Dodbiba
	M. Domi (vice-prés.)	A. Dodi
	B. Beci	J. Gjinari
	E. Çabej	J. Thomaj
Autriche	P. Wiesinger	
Belgique-Wallon	(Commission Royale de Toponymie et de Dialectologie, section wallonne)	
	J. Lechanteur (prés.)	L. Léonard
	A. Arnould	R. Mantou
	W. Bal	J. M. Pierret
	A. Boileau	M. Piron
	A. Goosse	L. Remacle
	J. Herbillon	P. Ruelle
	O. Jodogne	L. Warnant
Belgique-Flamand	(Koninklijke Commissie voor Toponymie en Dialectologie, Vlaamse afd.)	
	J. Goossens (prés.)	K. Roelandts
	M. Gysseling	A. Stevens
	J. Helsen	C. Tavernier-Vereecken
	A. van Loey	V. F. Vanacker
	J. L. Pauwels	
Bulgarie	I. Kočev (prés.)	Hr. Topalova-Simeonova
	T. Behar	M. Čalăkov
	Hr. Holiolčev	B. Velčeva-Bojadžieva
	E. Kjaeva	
Danemark	P. Andersen (prés.)	K. Ringgaard
	J. Asmussen	H. Spang-Hanssen
	I. Ejskjær	

Espagne	M. Alvar (prés.)	C. García
	E. Alarcos	A. Llorente
	A. Badía	L. Michelena
	T. Buesa	J. Veny
Finlande-finnois	T. Itkonen (prés.)	H. Leskinen
	O. Ikola	H. Paunonen
	J. Koivulehto	P. Sammallahti
	P. Lehtimäki	P. Virtaranta
	T. Lehtinen	L. Sarvas (secr.)
Finlande-suédois	C.-E. Thors du Comité suédois	
Lapon en Norvège, Suède, Finlande et URSS:	L.-G. Larsson	
France	G. Tuaillon (prés.)	J. E. Médélice
	H. Franconie	R. Stiers
	M. Giacomo-Marcellesi (pour le corse)	
	J. Le Dû (pour le breton)	
	M. Philipp (pour les parlers germaniques d'Alsace et de Moselle)	
	J. Allières (pour le basque)	
G. B. Angleterre et P. de Galles	M. F. Wakelin (prés.)	F. C. Stork
	P. Duncan	A. Thomas
	M. Durrell	P. Trudgill
	S. Ellis	Cl. Upton
	C. Heath	J. D. A. Widdowson
	J. Levitt	J. C. Wells
	G. Nixon	P. Wright
	D. Parry	
G.B. Écosse	H. Speitel (Écosse anglophone)	
	D. Clement (Écosse gaélique)	
G. B. Irlande du Nord	M. Barry	
Grèce	(Centre de Rédaction du Dictionnaire historique du Grec Moderne, langue commune et dialectes, de l'Académie d'Athènes), responsable pour l'ALE: N. Contossopoulos	

Hongrie	S. Imre (prés.)	B. Kálmán
	L. Balogh (secr.)	P. Király
	L. Benkő	A. Nyíri
	L. Deme	A. Sebestyén
	M. Hutterer	M. Temesi
Irlande, celtique	J. Watson	
Irlande, anglais	P. Henry	
Islande	(comité ad hoc formé par un groupe de linguistes néerlandais: P. Vermeyden et A. Key) conseiller spécial: J. A. Jónsson	
Italie	M. Cortelazzo (prés.)	C. Grassi
	A. Genre (secr.)	G. Francescato
	M. Contini	G. Pellegrini
Luxembourg	A. Atten	
Malte	J. Aquilina (prés.)	E. Fenech
	J. Cardona	M. R. Gatt
	J. Cassar Pullicino	E. Mifsud
Norvège	I. Hoff (prés.)	I. Frøyset
	O. Beito	T. Frette
	K. Bergsland	J. Øverby
	A. Bjørkum	G. Rundhovde
	A. Dalen	J. A. Schulze
	R. Djupedal	
Pays-Bas	H. Brok (prés.)	H. Hogerheijde
	J. Berns	G. Kocks
	J. Daan	E. Mooijman
	H. Entjes	J. de Rooij
	M. Gerritsen	A. Schaars
	A. Goeman	K. van der Veen
	P. Goossens	J. Vromans
Frison aux Pays-Bas et dans la R.F.A.	N. Århammar	

Pologne

(Comité de Dialectologie de l'Académie des Sciences Polonaise)

K. Dejna (prés.)	J. Siatkowski
Z. Stieber (prés. d'honneur)	M. Szymczak
	H. Tarborska
J. Basara (secr.)	S. Urbańczyk
J. Reichan	A. Zaręba

groupe de travail du Zaklad Językoznawstwa IJP-PAN:

A. Basara	N. Perczyńska
J. Basara	J. Sułkowska
D. Falińska	M. Szymczak
M. Mucowa	H. Zduńska

Portugal

(Grupo de Estudos de Dialectologia da Universidade de Lisboa)

M. Barros-Ferreira	J. Saramago
C. Lopez Augusto	M. G. Vitorino

RDA

R. Grosse (prés.)	R. Herrmann
G. Bergmann	S. Michałk
H. Faszke	H. Schönfeld
J. Grundlach	K. Spangenberg

RFA

R. Hildebrandt (prés.)	K. J. Mattheier
G. W. Baur	H. Niebaum
H. Beck	W. Sanders
G. Bellmann	E. Seidelmann
W. Besch	H. Steger
W. Kleiber	E. Wagner
W. König	

Roumanie

I. Coteanu (prés).	L. Ionescu-Ruxăndoiu
B. Cazacu (vice-prés.)	N. Mocanu
I. Pătruţ (vice-prés.)	L. Murádin
N. Saramandu (secr.)	P. Neiescu
V. Arvinte	I. Stan
E. Beltechi	T. Teaha
St. Binder	D. Uriţescu
S. Dumistrăcel	E. Vasiliu
I. Faiciuc	E. Vrabie

Suède

L. Elmevik (prés.)	H. Karlsson
E.-O. Bergfors (vice-prés.)	B. Pamp
	V. Reinhammar
L. Bleckert (secr.)	H. Ståhl
S. Benson	C.-E. Thors
K.-H. Dahlstedt	B. Wickmann
Å. Hansson	

Suisse

E. Schüle (prés.)	F. Spiess
A. Decurtins	R. Trüb
Z. Marzys	

Tchécoslovaquie

J. Petr (prés.)	Š. Ondruš
P. Jančák (secr.)	I. Ripka
J. Horecký	S. Utěšený
A. Lamprecht	A. Erhart (consultant)

Turquie

N. Yüce

URSS

V. V. Ivanov (prés.)	N. X. Maksjutova
N. Z. Donadze (secr.)	L. T. Maxmoutova
Š. Kh. Akbaev	U. A. Mejlanova
A. Ja. Blinkena	K. F. Morkunas
P. M. Bagov	R. Š. Nasibullin
G. G. Baraksanov	X. J. Neetar
M. J. Barmič	S. M. Djamirzaev
R. M. Batalova	B. A. Serebrennikov
N. T. Gišev	L. P. Sergeev
A. N. Zalesskij	N. T. Tabulova
N. I. Isanbaev	R. X. Temirova
G. M. Kert	E. R. Tenišev
N. T. Klyčev	H. A. Tokazov
A. A. Krivickij	N. N. Ouboušaev
C. A. Kalmykova	R. J. Udler
G. A. Klimov	D. V. Cygankin
P. N. Lisanets	

Yougoslavie

P. Ivić (prés.)	B. Finka
S. Remetić (secr.)	R. Flora
D. Brozović	S. Horvat
D. Cernecca	T. Logar
D. Čupić	L. Muljaku

	O. Penavin	B. Vidoeski
	D. Petrović	D. Vujičić
	J. Rigler	J. Vuković
	A. Šojat	
Chypre	C. P. Kyrris (prés.)	I. Theocharides
	M. Christodoulou	
Iles Féroé	J. H. W. Poulsen	
Langues Tziganes	D. Kenrick	

DÉPARTEMENTS DES GROUPES DE LANGUES

Les départements des groupes de langues sont constitués par les membres de la Rédaction et des Comités Nationaux spécialistes en la matière. La direction des départements est assurée par:

1. ROMANIA: G. Tuaillon (prés.) et J. Kruijsen (secr.)
2. GERMANIA CENTRALE: R. Grosse (prés.) et R. Hildebrandt (secr.)
3. GERMANIA NORD: P. Andersen (prés.) et L. Bleckert (secr.)
4. SLAVE ET BALTE: V. Ivanov (prés.) et M. Szymczak (secr.)
5. FINNO-OUGRIEN: T. Itkonen et B. Serebrennikov
6. AUTRES LANGUES DE L'OUEST: M. Alinei (prés.) et D. Clement (secr.)
7. AUTRES LANGUES DE L'EST: l'Institut de Linguistique de l'Académie des Sciences de l'URSS.
8. INDO-EUROPÉEN: T. Gamkrelidze, F. Kortlandt, W. Winter (composition provisoire).

COMITÉ DE PATRONAGE

C. Battisti†
V. I. Borkovskij
M. Cohen†
P. Gardette†
Vl. Georgiev
B. Havránek†
R. Jakobson†
V. Jansson
A. N. Kononov
W. Mitzka†
Chr. Mohrmann
W. Moulton
H. Orton†
G. Rohlfs
Al. Rosetti
A.-J. van Windekens

TABLE DES MATIÈRES

Comités Nationaux et Départements V
Table des Matières XIII
Introduction by Mario Alinei XV
Abréviations XLI
Aperçu général des réseaux des points XLIX
Réseau des points d'enquête LIII
Notation Phonétique LXXXIII
Translittérations des alphabets non-latins LXXXVII
Automatische ALE-Kartierung durch Wolfgang Putschke und Robert Neumann LXXXIX
Organigramme de l'ALE XCVII

Commentaires

I carte I.1, *Soleil* (QI:1), par G. Tuaillon 3
II carte I.2, *Lune* (QI:5), par D. Brozović 9
III carte I.3, *Brouillard* (QI:8), par Terho Itkonen 19
IV carte I.4, *Nuage* (QI:9), par Terho Itkonen 31
V carte I.5, *Vent* (QI: 11), par A. Weijnen 41
VI cartes I.6-I.9, *Arc-en-ciel* (QI:17), par Mario Alinei 47
VII carte I.10, *Grêle* (QI:19), par João Saramago et Gabriela Vitorino 81
VIII carte I.11, *Neige* (QI:20), par G. Tuaillon 91
IX cartes I.12 et I.13, *Flaque d'eau* (QI:18) par Ellen Mooijman 97
X carte I.14, *Étang* (QI:24), par Ellen Mooijman 113
XI carte I.15, *Lac* (QI:25), par Natacha Z. Donadze 127
XII carte I.16, *Mer* (QI:26), par Joep Kruijsen et I. Stan 135
XIII carte I.17, *Rivière* (QI:23), par B. A. Serebrennikov 141
XIV cartes I.18 et I.19, *Sauterelle* (QI:125), par R. I. Avanesov, V. V. Ivanov et N. Z. Donadze 147

Références bibliographiques 171

1. In presenting the first issue of maps and commentaries of the *Atlas Linguarum Europae* (ALE), the Linguistic Atlas of Europe, I consider it my first duty to pay homage to all those who with their work have contributed to the realization of this gigantic project: all members of the ALE Editorial Board, those of the ALE's National Committees and of the ALE's Language Departments, the staff of the ALE's Editorial Secretariat at Nijmegen and that of Marburg's Abteilung Linguistische Informatik im Forschungsinstitut für deutsche Sprache "Deutscher Sprachatlas". In this respect all European countries, officially represented in the ALE's organization, have given an equally important contribution to the realization of the ALE, and without this common effort, which has found its expression in a form of international co-operation, to my knowledge never before attained for a linguistic project, the ALE would not have come as far as this day. I think it is also important, in this respect, to underline the significance of this international co-operation for peace and for friendship among European peoples.

It is because of the ALE's debt towards so many people and institutions, and because of the impossibility for me to thank them all individually, that the list of Editors in the title page is in the next pages immediately followed by the list of all members composing the ALE's National Committees and Language Departments. These lists are not only intended as a mere formal acknowledgement but also as an expression of gratitude towards every single person mentioned in the lists. On the other hand, there are also many people in the different countries who do not belong to the above mentioned official organizations, but have still assisted us efficiently in many ways. Our gratitude towards them is equally great. The ALE thanks its existence to the devotion of so many people to the common goal.

In acknowledging the significance of this international co-operation, which is so evident in our project, I do not fail to see the exceptional importance of the contribution of some individuals for the realization of our project, and when I say this I am thinking in the first place of my predecessor, the first president of the ALE, Toon Weijnen. Weijnen has himself often (e.g. in ALE-Intr: 1.6.1-1.6.4) presented the ALE as the integration of three dif-

ferent, and independently started, projects: his own, that of L. E. Schmitt and mine. But without underestimating the value of ideas, it is one thing to conceive a project, another to create it. It is mostly Weijnen's merit that participation in the ALE has been accepted in every single European country, which he visited year after year as a true ALE ambassador, that is as an ambassador for European scientific co-operation at an official and institutional level; it is Weijnen who succeeded in creating a complex but efficient organization, based on the co-operation between Nijmegen's Secretariat and Marburg's Abteilung Linguistische Informatik im Forschungsinstitut für deutsche Sprache. Summing up almost twenty years of preparatory work, I do not hesitate to say that Weijnen's infatigable activity as an organizer on behalf of the ALE has been one of the main reasons, if not the determining one, for the success of the ALE as an enterprise.

I would also like to take this opportunity to pay homage to the memory of R. I. Avanesov, former Vice-President of the ALE for Socialist Europe, who died in Moscow May 1, 1981. Avanesov's support, as the leader of the *Obščeslavjanskij Lingvističeskij Atlas* (OLA), the Panslavonic Linguistic Atlas, was of determining importance to the ALE for the participation of the Soviet Union, and also on a scientific level I cannot omit recalling his speech at our first meeting in Moscow in 1979, in which, to my pleasant surprise, he presented a program for the motivational treatment of the lexical materials for the "sauterelle" (see here maps and commentary I.18-19), which largely coincided with my own treatment of the "arc-en-ciel" (see here maps and commentary I.6-9) presented by me immediately after Avanesov. I think this motivational approach – an innovation in linguistic geography that marks the ALE and to which I will return later – would not have had the success it has had in our project, had it not been for this convergence of ideas. It is due to the importance of Avanesov's role in the history of the ALE that, at its meeting at Leipzig in the spring of this year, the Editorial Board has decided to dedicate our first fascicle to his memory.

The late Jaromír Bělič and the late Witold Doroszewski, who were with Avanesov delegates of the International Committee of Slavists to the ALE in the period of its foundation, must also be mentioned with gratitude.

A special word of thanks should also be given to Wolfgang Putschke, the director of the Abteilung Linguistische Informatik im Forschungsinstitut für deutsche Sprache "Deutscher Sprachatlas", at the University of Marburg, who is as such responsible for the computer-aided realization of the maps and an especially important link in the organization of the project. Putschke will describe the activity of his centre for the ALE elsewhere in this volume (see also Putschke (1972) and (1977), the latter going beyond the ALE's scope).

I also consider it my duty to thank all international and national institutions which have helped the ALE morally and financially.

To begin with, our special thanks should go to the international organization which has given us its high patronage and support, moral as well as financial: the UNESCO. In particular, we would like to thank the UNESCO's Conseil International de la Philosophie et des Sciences Humaines and its Comité International Permanent des Linguistes. It would be one of the best rewards for our work to know that the ALE fulfilled the UNESCO's main purpose, as formulated in the 1st article of its Constitution, namely: "to contribute to peace and security by promoting collaboration among the nations through education, science and culture".

We would also like to thank the Union Académique Internationale for the patronage it has given us.

We express our deep gratitude to all national Academies of Sciences and similar European Organizations which have made it possible for National Committees to carry out their work for the ALE. In numerous cases, as I will describe in detail in one of the next sections, National Committees and their supporting institutions have had to start entirely new fieldwork with considerable investments.

The Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft in West Germany deserves a special mention for its financing of the computational realization of the project, one of the most expensive aspects of our project. A special word of thanks should be directed to the Dutch Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen (the Royal Academy of Sciences of the Netherlands) at Amsterdam, which has not only financed the work of the Dutch National Committee, but also the costs of the ALE Editorial Secretariat in Nijmegen. As regards the latter, the Catholic University of Nijmegen has also made substantial contributions. The Nederlandse Organisatie voor Zuiver-Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek (Netherlands Organization for the Advancement of Pure Research) should be thanked for the financing of both the project and the publication.

Some institutions deserve our thanks for having especially appointed scientific personnel for the ALE research. In alphabetical order of their official names they are: the Soviet Akademija Nauk SSSR (Academy of Sciences of the USSR), the French Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, the Spanish Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Cientificas, Departamento de Geografia Lingüística, the West German Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft, the Swedish Humanistik-Samhälls Vetenskapsliga Forskningsrådet (Swedish Council for Research in the Humanities), the Austrian Kommission für Mundartkunde und Namenforschung, the Dutch Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, the Finnish Kotimaisten kielten tutkimuskeskus (Research Center for Finland's Domestic Languages), the Scandinavian Nordisk Kulturfond, the Finnish Valtion humanistinen toimikunta (State's Commission for Humanistic Sciences).

Our thanks should also go to the institutions of those countries which have given the ALE financial support for the organization of editorial meetings and for colloquia. In chronological order they are: the West German Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (1970: Köln; 1975, 1978: Marburg), the Dutch Department for Sciences and Education (1970, 1971, 1972, 1973: Nijmegen; 1980: Amsterdam), the Czechoslovakian Academy of Sciences (1972: Prague), the Rumanian Academy of Sciences (1974: Bucarest), the French Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique (Strasburg: 1976), the Polish Academy of Sciences (Warsaw: 1977), the Soviet Akademija Nauk SSSR (Moscow: 1979), the Commune of Bardonecchia (a Provençal speaking village in Northwest Italy: 1981), the Danish Institut for dansk Dialektforskning of the University of Copenhagen (Copenhagen: 1982) and Leipzig's Sächsische Akademie der Wissenschaften in the German Democratic Republic (Leipzig: 1983).

Without listing them, most European countries belonging to the ALE's large Language Departments deserve our thanks for their financial support in organizing the meetings of their Language Departments.

A central role in the organization of the ALE is played by its Editorial Secretariat at Nijmegen, and Joep Kruijsen should be thanked for the devotion with which he fulfills the task of Editorial Secretary.

And finally I would like to use this opportunity to thank those persons who have been working exclusively for the ALE, thanks to the generous subventions we have received: besides the ALE's Editorial Secretary also Natasha Donadze, secretary of the Soviet delegation; Robert Neumann, L. Wömpner, K. Schreiner, C. Schnicke-Hummel and H. Poles of Marburg's Abteilung Linguistische Informatik; Hélène Franconie, Roger Stiers and Jeanine Médélice for research on Gallo-Roman and for secretarial work for the Romance Department; Lars Bleckert, secretary of the Northern Germanic Department; Merja Sorsakivi and Leena Sarvas for research on Finnish and for secretarial work for the Uralic Department; Lars-Gunnar Larsson for research on Lapp dialects and Ellen Mooijman, who has been an ALE researcher at Nijmegen for several years.

2. My succession as a President of the ALE took place in 1982, at the dawn of the publication of the ALE's Essay Volume, our first, experimental result. Since the complete history of the ALE is spelled out in the minutes of the more than 20 ALE meetings and colloquia from 1970 on, it would be pointless and would require too much space to summarize it here. In 1982 the major problem we had to face was the criticism we had just received with regard to our planned Essay Volume, a plan which, owing to this criticism, we subsequently withdrew. It fell upon me to suggest and to implement changes in the project organization and publication plans in order to eliminate or to reduce the criticism, and once more I feel obliged at this point to thank all ALE-editors, and in particular the former president Toon Weijnen, Terho Itkonen, Pavle Ivić, Gaston Tuaillon and Werner Winter, for the support I received in a particularly difficult period. Since our answer to that criticism has now found its way into this first publication, I will now concentrate on the description of what we hope to have achieved with this first fascicle and what we hope to improve in the next fascicles, rather than on a summary of the criticism. Since this fascicle and the following ones will all be lexical, while the other parts of the publication (concerning phonetics, syntax, semantic fields etc.) are not yet in discussion at the moment, I will deal only with the lexical part of the ALE.

3. As a project in lexical geography the ALE can be defined as an *interpretive atlas of the fourth generation*. What do I mean by this definition? If we place the beginning of institutional geolinguistics at 1903, with the beginning of the publication of the first national linguistic atlas, Gilliéron's *Atlas Linguistique de la France* (ALF), we can classify all linguistic atlases, from the ALF on (but also previously started atlases can be included in the classification), on the basis of two main criteria: A) A *territorial criterion*, according to which an atlas can be of the "first generation", if it is national; "second generation", if it is regional and initiated with the intention of offering more precise data on an already investigated national territory; "third generation", if it is supranational, but limited to a single language group; and "fourth generation" if it is not only supranational, but also interlingual. B) A *methodological criterion*, according to which an atlas can be raw-data based or interpretive. This classification not only follows the external history of linguistic geography, but also —and especially — its internal logic: raw data must precede interpretation (even though interpretive atlases can be realized without passing through a publication of raw data; but this is an exception in the development of linguistic geography). The need for regional, that is microscopic, analysis derives from the existence of a general picture of a whole territory. At the same time, a need deriving from existing national atlases also inspires research beyond national borders, for the continuum of dialects often crosses political frontiers: hence the need to recompose a broken picture, to place together national atlases in more meaningful units, those offered by language groups, such as Romania, Germania, Slavonia and the like.

But a definition like "an interpretive atlas of the fourth generation" does not render all aspects of novelty inherent to the ALE, at least in its intentions. I have said that raw data must exist prior to interpretation. Conversely, to give more emphasis to this principle, it should be said that raw data *must* be interpreted if they are to acquire meaning. The history of linguistic geography shows with great clearness that this was indeed the development, and that

immediately after the publication of national atlases a long line of interpretive research began. Theoretically, this line of interpretive research is manifold, in the sense that it can proceed in many different directions, operating at the different linguistic levels: phonology, etymology (lexicon), morphology, syntax, semantics, etc., and with different methodologies. In practice, however, only two lines have been constantly followed, that of phonetics/phonology and that of lexicon. For lexicon, which is the only line that interests us at the moment, two separate developments can be (and have been) theoretically distinguished, namely *onomasiology* (the study of different names for the same referent in a given area) and *semasiology* (the study of different meanings of the same etymon in a given area). Morphological interpretation adds a further processing to lexical materials which have already been processed onomasiologically.

As a lexical project the ALE should be placed in this important line of interpretive research, in particular of onomasiologic research, the line for which Quadri could already give some thousand titles for Romania and Germania alone in 1952. It would be impossible to condense here the immense merits of onomasiologic research for linguistic as well as for cultural history: though usually neglected by general historians, onomasiology can be seen as one of the most powerful tools for investigating and discovering the complex network of historical, geographical, cultural and ethnic factors which have resulted in lexical and semantic, and thus in cultural differences, as well as similarities, within and without a given linguistic area. The difficulty in illustrating the importance of onomasiology for general history in a few lines lies in the complexity of both concepts: that is in the fact that there are too many linguistic examples connected with too many areas of culture, and that consequently no single example can adequately represent the general relationship between the concepts *language* and *culture*. Nevertheless, let me give an example by way of the following, trivial question: how much would our knowledge of European history suffer if we ignored the (history of the) names of the days of the week in European languages and dialects, with their evident pagan and/or christian motivations? For a whole chapter of European history is frozen, as it were, in pre-christian names such as English *Saturday* (the day of the god Saturn) and *Sunday* (the day of the god Sun), as compared to christianized names such as French *Samedi* (Sabbath day) and *Dimanche* (the Lord's day). For thousands of words, as rich in historical content as those I have just mentioned, it belongs to the magic of semantics that we can use them functionally, that is as face-value coins in our daily communication, while at the same time we are actually exchanging antiquarian treasures. Without detracting from the value of any serious study of the functional use of words as "currency" in our communication, which is nowadays by far the most fashionable object of scientific interest, the other side of the coin, the antiquarian one, is certainly no less interesting, and I believe it should belong to the ALE's aims to reawaken the interest of young linguists for the historical and cultural study of language, enriched by the powerful, theoretical and methodological tools that are now at our disposal.

Coming to more technical aspects of this question, it might be useful to remember now that from the point of view of method onomasiology necessarily rests on the etymological interpretation of the raw lexical data, in such a way that forms representing a development of the same etymon will form a single area on the linguistic map. Since onomasiology was and still is mostly an investigation based on national atlases, the etymological level that had to be reached was necessarily that of the proto-language that could be considered as the direct ancestor of the dialects of the given area. In drawing an onomasiologic map for France, or for Germany, or for Poland, it would be absurd to reach an Indo-European level: the local proto-language will not only be sufficient, but also the most relevant for the determination of the internal lexical isoglosses. Strangely enough, as opposed to the enormous amount of "national" onomasiologic research achieved since the publication of national atlases, very little work of systematic kind has been done for areas of language groups (such as the whole Romania, or the whole Germania), with one exception to which I will return shortly. The hundreds of articles and monographs about the names for a certain referent in a certain country, are contrasted by an incredible scarcity of works on the names for a certain referent in the area of a language group. Whatever the reason for this phenomenon may be, researchers who have ventured to draw onomasiologic maps for whole language-group areas stand out as exceptions: such as Rohlfs (1971), which represents the best known example of systematic onomasiology for the whole Romania, be it on a very sketchy and incomplete level.

I mentioned an exception to the rule: there has been one example of systematic approach to onomasiology for a whole language-group area, and that is the example of the Slavonic countries with their splendid, but alas not yet published, project of the *Obščeslavjanskij Lingvističeskij Atlas* (OLA), the Panslavonic Linguistic Atlas. As a preparation for this project, many excellent onomasiologic studies have been published that cover the whole Slavonic area, such as Tolstoy's study of the Slavonic names for the "rainbow" (1976), to mention one of which I made thorough use for my own investigation into European names for the rainbow (see here I. 6-9). The importance of the OLA is twofold: not only does it represent the first project of a linguistic atlas covering a whole language-group area of Europe, and one of its major ones, but it has also played a determining role in the realization of the ALE. I think it can be safely stated that the ALE would not be a reality now if the OLA had not preceded us, for on the one hand Slavonic dialectologists, by going beyond their own national frontiers, were, as it were, ripe for a further step,

and on the other hand, without the infrastructure already created for the OLA, participation of Slavonic countries in the ALE would have been impossible.

Although the OLA's actual publication has not yet taken place, the chronological and, more important, the logical course of linguistic geography remains the same: the first generation of atlases consisted of raw-data based national atlases (I a) with subsequent onomasiologic interpretation (I b); the second generation of atlases, still actively produced, presents raw-data regional (micro-)atlases (II a), followed by the usual interpretive studies (II b); the third generation, covering an entire language-group area, is still little represented by the already mentioned, unpublished OLA (a combined, raw-data (III a) and interpretive atlas (III b)), and by the equally mentioned, interpretive sketch (III b) of Rohlfs (1971); and finally the fourth generation is also represented at both levels, by the (yet to be published) *Atlante Linguistico Mediterraneo* (ALM), as a raw-data interlingual atlas (IV a), and by our interpretive, interlingual atlas (IV b), the ALE.

The ALE thus represents a necessary development out of the previously published, or previously conceived, national and language-group atlases on the one hand, as well as a necessary development from raw-data based to interpretive atlases on the other. On both lines, there is a dialectical relationship between the respective stages: no national atlas can really give an adequate picture of dialect continua, as dialects usually continue beyond political frontiers; but neither can language-group atlases avoid crossing frontiers to trace the origin of loanwords, as Rohlfs (1971) so often does in his sketchy maps, introducing Greece, or Germany, or other non-Romance areas, to trace the origin of Romance loanwords. And the development from raw data to interpretation is self-evident, when new atlases cover the same territory of already published raw-data atlases.

I think it is the same dialectics that, as it were, impose a further step forward: given a common heritage for each of the six language families present in geographic Europe, namely Altaic, Basque, Caucasian, Indo-European, Semitic and Uralic, why not map these families together, making crosscultural relationships visible, and thus crossdating possible? In my opinion, there is little chance of a serious breakthrough in historical and geographic linguistics unless different language groups and families are studied simultaneously in their mutual relationships and on the basis of one of their most important parameters, namely their *dialect* continuum in historical and modern times. *Dialects*, and not only *languages*, since any comparative study of standard languages, such as Buck (1971) and many others, by neglecting dialects, necessarily gives only a partial and incomplete reconstruction of the linguistic continuum; *modern* dialects, and not only *ancient* languages, as is traditional in Indo-European studies, for it is possible that

modern dialects preserve more archaic features than the most archaic written documents, as has been repeatedly shown in Romance dialectology with regard to Latin, and in folklore by Propp (1946), who has proved that modern folk literature can be more ancient than ancient mythology.

Finally, there is a more subtle, history-bound, dialectical relationship between the different types of atlases and the nature of their frontiers: frontiers of national atlases are, by definition, political, as they answer, primarily, national scientific interests. Language-group atlases, as the yet unpublished OLA or the monograph on Romania by Rohlfs, have by definition linguistic frontiers, since they aim at completing the broken picture offered by national atlases. What can the next step be for interlingual atlases: political or linguistic? In Europe neither, for certain: for political frontiers that encompass entire language families and even language groups do not seem to exist. And broader linguistic borders would involve, even for single languages (e.g. for English, Spanish, Portuguese and Russian), more than one continent, and thus pose unsolvable problems, both organizational and financial. Hence the "synthesis", in dialectical terms, offered by geographical frontiers: the geographical frontiers of Europe offer an optimum of conditions for organizational and financial feasibility and for the achievement of those relevant interlinguistic and crosscultural results that scientific development demands, after the realization of national atlases in the greatest part of Europe and the advanced preparation of language-group atlases.

By this justification I do not mean to disregard the difficulties or the problems posed by the ALE, but only to show that the ALE achieves the results demanded by scientific development, to such a degree as is shown by the existence of this first fascicle. For, in essence, the ALE represents at the same time: A) the realization of the national or regional atlases not yet existing; B) the realization of language-group atlases, in so far as possible within European territory; and C) a synthesis of all of this within the geographic borders of Europe. It has taken the faith and the conviction of many people and of many institutions to realize this goal. The very fact that so many people and so many institutions all over Europe have believed in the same goal, is not only a sign that Europe is ripe for unity in differences, but a very rewarding experience from a human point of view, which makes one hope international co-operation and friendship among peoples is possible, even in present conditions.

At the same time we should not hide our weakness, which I find especially in the fact that the "third generation" of atlases, that of the language groups as they are represented in geographic Europe, are still unsufficiently represented. In this sense, in spite of the OLA's plans and excellent preparatory studies, Rohlfs' monograph on the Romania, some studies with a broader Germanic horizon published by Schmitt's pupils, Jan Goossens' forthcoming public-

ation of a supranational, Franconian atlas (*Sprachatlas des nördlichen Rheinlands und des südöstlichen Niederlands (Fränkischer Sprachatlas:* FSA)), and comparable plans, the ALE is still "skipping", as it were, a whole generation of atlases. Our task would indeed have been much easier if we could have based ourselves on at least some atlases covering entire language-group areas. But we are convinced that the experience of the ALE Language Departments will be of fundamental importance for the promotion of such atlases, and even if this promotional work could be our only merit, I do not think it would be negligible. Certainly one could reproach us for our ambition, but to this we can say that there can be no pioneer work without it.

4. I have spoken of a great research tradition in the field of interpretive lexical geography, represented especially by onomasiology. In the history of lexical geography, almost all interpretation of raw data and the study of the resulting areal distribution have, in fact, taken place at onomasiologic level, and scarcely at that of semasiology. After Jaberg's (1936) brilliant presentation of semasiological research for Romance dialect geography, very little research has been conducted in this direction (Alinei 1965, 1968 and 1974a seem to have spurred little new research). Therefore, the ALE represents, also in this regard, an innovation of considerable significance, as it presents maps, which we have called *motivational*, but which in reality are maps of comparative semasiology: a branch of synchronic and diachronic geosemantics which in the wide horizon offered by the ALE finds not only a challenge, but also a theoretical justification and an adequate test. As is known, semasiology starts with a lexical form, usually an etymon, at the level immediately before it, and maps all of its semantic developments. For obvious reasons this method cannot be applied in an area such as that of the ALE, where by definition there can be no common etymon for the whole area (without considering modern words of course). As I have already said, the method of motivational maps has been conceived in the framework of the ALE (which is certainly no accident) by the Soviet committee for the map "sauterelle" and by the present writer for the map "arc-en-ciel": both these maps and commentaries appear in this first fascicle of the ALE (I. 6-9, I. 18-19). A motivational map does not map etyma in a strict sense, but "motivations" of etyma (for the distinction see Alinei 1974b and 1980a), depending on how transparent or unproblematic these are. It is no coincidence that the two questions that have been treated motivationally, that is "sauterelle" and "arc-en-ciel", have both produced mostly compound words, compounds being, by definition, etymologically transparent. From a theoretical and methodological viewpoint, however, the distinction between transparent and opaque words ought to be further elaborated. In Alinei (1982) I have proposed a distinction between *etymography* and *etymothesis*, to account for a fundamental methodological difference

between the purely historical and interdisciplinary reconstruction of the cultural context of transparent and unproblematic motivations and the speculative reconstruction of etyma (and thus of motivations) themselves, with an inherent documentary weakness. As every theoretical and methodological opposition, it points to verifiable opposites, at the same time permitting a more precise definition and classification of intermediate cases. From the standpoint of interdisciplinary collaboration between historical linguistics (semantics) and other historical sciences there is no doubt then that only *etymography* offers the rigorous documentation and evidence which are necessary and sufficient for any well-grounded historical reconstruction, whereas *etymothesis*, being a necessarily self-centered linguistic exercise, offers little basis for interdisciplinary collaboration. It is not without reason that an anthropologist such as Davis in his much discussed book (1977: 237) can state: "anthropologists have not devised criteria for weighing etymological evidence" (even though, fortunately, there have been anthropologists who have used their own intuition for that purpose). But have linguists thought of devising such criteria? I do not think so, even though there is, in fact, a fundamental difference between the interdisciplinary problem of interpreting transparent (and illuminating) semantic developments such as that from Latin *pecus* "herd (of sheep), cattle" to *pecunia* "money" or, conversely, from Latin *capitale* (through Northern French) to English *cattle*; from the original meaning of Latin *cultura*, i.e. "farm cultivation" to the later development "culture, education"; from "God's bow", "Allah's bow", "old woman's belt", "dragon's belt", "snake" and the like, to "rainbow", and thousands more; and the purely linguistic problem of reconstructing opaque motivations, such as that of Fr. *trouver* and It. *trovare*, "to find". Do these words come from a primitive fishing context, as Schuchardt proposed with his hypothesis of Lat. *turbare* ("(water) trouble"), and relevant examples of the fishing technique from Sardinia; or from a medieval and "intellectual" context, as Thomas, Paris and Spitzer advocated with their hypothesis of Lat. **tropare* (from *tropus*), evoking the context of *troubadour* poetry? Whatever the answer (and without excluding alternative solutions), there is little hope that any serious culture historian would utilize either example to support some general theory of culture. Transparent or unproblematic motivations, susceptible of etymographic description, can, on the contrary, always be used as objective documentation and thus as evidence for historical reconstruction, as in the case of the development from *pecus* to *pecunia*, or from "farming" to "culture" in *cultura*, both of fundamental importance for the reconstruction of the pastoralist and agricultural components of our prehistory. True, in some cases the interpretation of unproblematic motivations is not necessarily always the same and I am sure this will also be the case for my own reconstruction of the stadial development of the "rainbow" representation in

Europe; but this is in no way different from what happens with any historical interpretation, even of events such as the French Revolution or World War II, where significant differences in interpretation can certainly occur (as a consequence of ideological reference frames), even though the documentation is essentially the same. Basically, the difference between the methods I have called etymography and etymothesis, is that in the first the data are known, and the scholar's task is simply their interpretation, while in the second the data themselves are the very object of the investigation. Although there is, as I have already said, a clear transition area between the two opposites, just as the presence of semi-vowels and semi-consonants does not prevent us from distinguishing between vowels and consonants, I think this transition area should not prevent us from distinguishing the two, fundamentally different, etymological methods, and thus from attributing only to etymography the status of interdisciplinary field par excellence.

The reason for this, possibly too long, discussion of the theoretical and methodological distinction between documentary and speculative etymology, lies in the necessity to account for what I consider a fundamental feature of the ALE as a scientific tool. Linguistic maps such as those of the ALE, embracing a historically rich continent such as Europe, potentially offer very good chances of producing culturally significant pictures of European prehistory and history, but they are inherently limited by that variable, which I have just described, namely their degree of semantic transparency. The contribution that linguists can give to the reconstruction of the English (and European) history of *copper* and *paper* is radically different from that concerning the history of *bronze*, for in the first case they can offer the illuminating information that *copper* comes from the name of the copper-producing island of Cyprus, and *paper* from that of the paper-producing Egyptian plant *papyrus*; while in the second, in describing the word *bronze* as of "uncertain origin", they actually admit being emptyhanded. By presenting itself as internally differentiated, and thus by clearly distinguishing its documentary results from its speculative efforts, etymology can claim a first-rank position among historical sciences for its etymographic branch, at the same time using the objective semantic typology thus obtained to throw light on the dark side of etymothetic materials, in a renewed attempt to reduce their territory, as well as their documentary weakness.

It is no accident that out of the 14 questions included in the first fascicle, 12 have received an *onomasiologic* and only 2 a *motivational* treatment. This is because motivational maps are only possible if the majority of materials are semantically transparent and, as I have already said, only "sauterelle" and "arc-en-ciel" present a majority of such materials, namely compounds. The ratio of 12 to 2, however, does not mean that there has been no treatment of motivations in the onomasiologic maps or in their commentaries, but simply

that onomasiology took priority in the conceptual hierarchy of the maps because the global degree of transparency of the map was not sufficient to justify a reversal in the treatment. In fact, in the onomasiologic map "lune", by Brozović (see here, I. 2), the very choice of onomasiologic symbols expresses information about motivations, and not only Brozović, but also Itkonen (I. 3, 4), Tuaillon (I. 1, 11) and other authors give systematic information about motivations, wherever these are significant. In the next fascicles we hope to be able to increase the ratio of motivational maps to onomasiologic ones, but, as already explained, the strict condition for motivational maps, i.e. transparency of most lexical materials, will always pose a limitation. What we hope we can do for future fascicles is to select for publication questions that have proven to have a majority of transparent materials.

It must also be clear that not only motivational maps, but also onomasiologic ones can have a high cultural significance, depending on the amount of transparent areas presented by the latter, as would be the case with a European map for "copper", for example, or for "paper".

5. The number of questions of our first fascicle (14) does not correspond with the number of maps (19). This is the result of another innovation in the treatment of materials, due to which each question can receive a multiple treatment. The question "flaque d'eau" has been treated with two onomasiologic maps (I.12-13) by E. Mooijman; the question "sauterelle" with two motivational maps (I.18-19) by R. Avanesov, V. Ivanov and N. Donadze, and the question "arc-en-ciel" with one onomasiologic and three motivational maps (I.6-9) by the writer of these lines. We plan to promote the production of these multiply treated maps, because we find them quite suitable for the large scale of our territory and the abundance of materials. We also hope to be able to combine already published, single maps, into new, structural ones; to write commentaries for several maps at the same time, and to publish monographs on those (sets of) maps that lend themselves for a larger commentary, such as my own monograph, now long due, on the European names of the "rainbow".

6. One of the recent decisions of the Editorial Board has been to separate the publication of the maps from that of the commentaries, which originally should have been published on the back of the maps. This separation will facilitate the editing of both volumes – each with a very distinct technical character – and at the same time offer more space for rich and interesting commentaries. In this fascicle, however, most of the commentaries preserve the size imposed by the previous plan.

7. Another recent decision of the Editorial Board has been to publish in a third separate publication, the raw materials of the ALE. This publication (beginning with this first fascicle) will not take place simultaneously with that

of the other two issues of maps and commentaries; nevertheless it will form an important complement to the ALE: for it will justify the interpretations that appear in maps and commentaries; it will permit alternative interpretations of the same materials (using blank maps that will be made available to interested investigators); it will offer the necessary philological justification of the other two parts and will also represent a compensation for any excess of heterogeneity that, in spite of our efforts to avoid it, might intrude in our fascicles.

8. The presentation of legends and the method of symbolization have also been made more uniform, wherever possible. The decimal numbering has been introduced in all symbol systems of legends and, in onomasiologic maps, with a maximum of three levels: the first for etymology, the second for the chief variants within an etymology, which are usually morphological (derivations, compounds, stem-types etc.); the third for possible unpredictable phonetic variants (exceptionally used also for lower-rank morphological variants and – in the second system of legend organization (see further) – for items belonging to different language groups, notwithstanding their possible formal identity). So two symbols codified, for example, by 1.1 and 2.1 will represent different (groups of) etyma; two codes such as 1.2 and 1.3 will in standard cases express an internal, morphological difference within a group of cognate forms; and two codes such as 1.2.3 and by 1.2.4 will usually represent (groups of) etymologically and morphologically related forms, somehow differentiated at another level.

Symbols for words having a common etymon (or for similar motivations) have a common base figure (e.g. a square, a triangle, a circle, an oval, a line etc.), thus constituting a "symbol family"; morphological and phonetic (or motivational) variants have been marked by minor modifications of the base figures, or by diacritics attached to them.

Another editorial intervention has been to reduce the number of symbol families to about 40, to make the maps more readable. Having reached this maximum, groups of two letters are used. The disadvantage of letters vs symbols obviously lies in the shape of the former, which can interfere with that of symbols; but in practice 40 families of symbols exhaust most materials, and letters never appear in such large areas as to create confusion (see further for an elaboration of this question). More complex, and thus not yet solved, are the questions of the organization of the legend in its relationship with the symbol system, and that of the symbolization of hapax legomena. Both questions concern only onomasiologic maps: motivational maps have their own structure, determined by the sort of motivations and by the ordering imposed on them.

As to the question of legend organization, the first fascicle shows basically

two different systems: one, in which symbols group lexical cognates regardless of the language groups to which they belong, and the ordering of the symbols (and thus of language groups) is free. This is the system used most in the onomasiologic maps of the first fascicle. In the second system, applied only by Itkonen in his two maps "brouillard" (I.3) and "nuage" (I.4), the ordering of language-groups is fixed (coinciding with a conventional ordering from North-West to South-East) and lexical cognates are grouped according to this fixed order, with external references between cognates. At the last meeting at Leipzig, the Editorial Board opted for neither system; in fact it suggested that ordering symbols by frequency of netpoints would offer a third system, and it expressed a preference for freedom of choice between alternative systems, provided these would be clearly defined. I see this position as the most correct and promising for the future of the ALE: what we should strive to attain is not so much the identification of an "ideal" system of representation, which probably does not exist given the ALE's extremely rich typology of maps, often with radically different characteristics; but rather the explicit description of two or more different systems, among which the author is free to choose. What should be eliminated is not so much the choice between alternative and explicit methods, as the presence of unsystematic methods, or methods that are used without an explicit justification.

The question of the representation of hapax legomena on the maps is strictly connected with the readability of maps, given the high number of hapax legomena that can occur on certain maps. In the discussion of this question at Leipzig, the Editorial Board first of all came to an explicit definition of the concept of hapax legomenon, which in linguistic geography can manifest itself in two different forms: in a broad sense, i.e. as a *lexical* hapax legomenon (an item without etymological connections on the map but present in more than one point), and in a strict sense, i.e. as a *geographical* hapax legomenon (an item that is isolated not only etymologically, but also geographically). Accordingly, the Board has decided to tentatively apply a threefold system of symbolization to ALE lexical materials: I) Proper symbols for the most important (frequent) lexical groupings; II) Pairs of letters for the minor items, now defined as *lexical* hapax legomena (and providing they do not interfere with symbols), and III) A single sign (a small circle) for all *geographic* hapax legomena, whose point number is then given in the legend. This system, however, has the disadvantage of allowing minority languages, often represented by single points on the ground map, to appear disproportionately often as geographic hapax legomena. For these points, then, the normal symbolization will be applied. With some minor exceptions (due to the short lapse of time between Leipzig and publication deadlines), this system has been followed in the first fascicle.

9. Following recent editorial decisions, commentaries have also been revised and, as much as possible, unified. Uniformity has been sought within a two-model choice, which opposes *article-like* commentaries to *list-like* ones. In the first, authors present their own interpretation of the map and of the areas, or of other, special aspects of the map; while in the second authors limit themselves to a justification of the etymologies chosen for the mapping of materials, with a precise indication of the sources used. We have decided that a greater measure of unification, given the difference in the degree of interest, and in general typology, would not be possible, let alone desirable. However, we do think that a justification of etymologies represents a minimal condition for onomasiologic treatment of materials. The following fascicles can certainly be improved as far as this point is concerned, as it was impossible for certain commentaries to be re-elaborated in the short time that was available after this decision was taken. In the future, separate publication of maps and commentaries will offer the necessary space for larger commentaries, more so than was possible at the last moment for this first fascicle. On the whole, what we have tried to achieve even in this first fascicle is a degree of editorial uniformity that would not exclude freedom of choice for authors, on the basis of the organizational structure that we describe in the next section.

Commentaries of motivational maps are supplemented by the lists of original materials, which are classified in the same order as the legends, namely that of the motivations. Within each motivation the materials are ordered alphabetically, first on the basis of the language group, then of the single languages. Each form is then followed by its coordinates. This apparatus represents a philological justification of the authors' interpretation and classification, and thus allows the reader to rearrange the materials in a different classification, if he so wishes.

In the list of *Réponses doubles* the number in brackets following some forms corresponds to the number of the legend in which the etymology of the given form can be found.

10. The organizational structure of the ALE has now become the following: the 39 *National Committees* (see the full list above) are each responsible for the collection of materials and for their preliminary etymological analysis, each in the respective territorial unit. The 8 *Linguistic Departments* (Romance, Northern Germanic, Central Germanic, Balto-Slavonic, Uralic, other Western languages, other Eastern languages, and Indo-European, the latter a very recent and important addition) are the organs responsible for the unification and optimalization of the onomasiologic analysis within the borders of language groups and families. The *Editorial Board*, now composed of 34 members – usually called *Editors* – is collectively responsible for the whole project. Several *Editorial Committees*, each composed of some 10 members of the Editorial Board, have the task of controlling and editing the maps and commentaries presented to them by *Authors*. These, in turn, are scholars who are not necessarily members of the Editorial Board, but receive all the information from Linguistic Departments and National Committees in order to come to a global map and commentary. From the point of view of editorial and scientific responsibility this model is close to that of any serial publication (encyclopedia, journal and the like), in which a group of editors and individual authors have a different task, the former supervising the latter. To complete the picture, there remain the *President*, assisted by two *Vice-Presidents* (one for each of the two political halves of Europe), a *Coordinating Committee* (whose number of members has recently been enlarged), some *Ad hoc Committees* for special problems (such as the recent *Theoretical Committee*), and the *Editorial Secretariat*, where all the results of the project eventually arrive. A special place in the organizational structure is taken by the *Computational Center* of Marburg, which has the task of creating machine-readable input out of the materials presented by the different organs and plotting them into computer-made maps and legends. An organogram prepared by the Editorial Secretariat is published further in this volume, to illustrate the complex operational network that connects the different organs of the ALE at the different stages of the project.

From the newly created Indo-European Department, Theoretical Committee and enlarged Coordinating Committee we expect improvements in the quality of our results.

11. The ALE research area has been modified with regard to the plans presented in ALE-INTR. (5.1.1): as the ground map clearly shows, the area now extends to the Ural chain, to the Ural river and to the northern side of the Caucasian chain. This border is the one used most by geographers for the delimitation of Europe and, as I have argued earlier, the Editorial Board has decided that a geolinguistic project as the ALE can only have geographic borders, if political and linguistic ones are to be discarded. Linguistically, the major consequence of this decision has been the inclusion on the ALE maps of a number of very interesting languages and dialects of the USSR, mostly unknown or very little known in Western Europe (where "many educated people . . . imagine Russian to be the only language of (the USSR)"; ignoring that "the USSR is a multinational state, containing some 130 different ethnic groups, speaking some 130 different languages", with Russian "being spoken as a native language by some 58,6% of the total population (of the USSR)": Comrie 1981:1). This geographic border, naturally, breaks several linguistic families that continue in Asia, such as the Uralic (both Finno-Ugric and Samoyedic languages being represented on both sides of the border), the Altaic (both Turkic and Mongolian, on both sides of the border), the

Caucasian. But this is in no way different from what would have happened to single languages such as English, Spanish, Portuguese, or Russian, which all continue beyond mountains or oceans into other continents, had we chosen for linguistic borders. The fact is that political and geographic frontiers do not necessarily coincide with linguistic borders, just as linguistic areas do not necessarily coincide with geographic units. And there is an added complication: linguistic borders are constantly crossed by loanwords, in both directions, so that even if one would take, for example, the intercontinental "Anglo-Saxonia", as research area, it would be necessary to pursue currents of loanwords coming into the area from all the languages of the different adjacent territories, and at the same time all the English loanwords, not necessarily the same ones, spreading out of "Anglo-Saxonia" into the different territories bordering on it. Similarly Russian, though in a more compact area than English, would introduce different loanwords in different non-Russian areas, and at the same time receive loanwords of different languages in different parts of the basic area of Russian. No doubt a linguistic atlas would find an easier delimitation within linguistic borders than within other, political or geographic ones, but as I have already argued, a geographic border is neither better nor worse than a political one, and the impossibility of either political or linguistic borders for the ALE has left us with no better alternative than an "objective" geographic one. Linguistically speaking, continuation of our linguistic families beyond our geographic borders is secured by the etymological treatment of our materials, which connects Europe not only with Asia, but also with Africa, to mention well-known examples.

There remains, as one of the primary arguments that need a presentation here, the immense cultural importance of geographic Europe, of its prehistory and history, as well as of its present. It is the picture of Europe as a cradle of past and present cultures, that we would like to see represented in some of our maps; not only for the benefit of Europeans of East and West, but also for scholars and students of emerging peoples in other continents: in the hope that our first, imperfect example of a continental linguistic survey will be followed in the reconstruction of those complex relations among peoples and cultures in Asia, Africa, America and Australia, of which language contacts are one of the most important consequences, and one of the most significant pieces of evidence. The unity of history and culture on the one hand, and the differences in language, religion, and political systems on the other, make Europe a perfect testing ground for an enterprise such as the ALE. We make absolutely no claim as to the results we have achieved, but we do underline that there must be a first attempt if improvements are to follow. Needless to say, we have learned very much from projects similar to ours, such as the *Atlante Linguistico Mediterraneo* (ALM), and we look up to future projects now in preparation, such as the "fourth-generation", interlingual (despite its

"national" borders) Nepal language atlas, directed by Werner Winter. We feel strongly that our world is ripe for such crosscultural, interlingual and international ventures, that all countries will benefit from the results of enterprises of this kind and that in particular the need for mutual knowledge and the consciousness of a world-wide common heritage will increase.

12. The ALE *maps* (which have been reduced to the scale 1:10 million, with regard to the originally planned double scale: cf ALE-INTR, 5.2.2) have been printed by the Institut für angewandte Geodäsie (IfAG) at Frankfurt am Main, which has utilized four colours to distinguish the following cartographic levels: I) Political frontiers (of three different orders, as in the USSR, or of only two, as in many other countries), capitals, great rivers and seas (grey-blue); II) Mountains above m. 1000 (yellow). III) The numbers of the net points and the codes of language membership for each point (red). IV) The symbols and the text of the final *interpretive map* (black). The last two cartographic levels are plotted on film by the Abteilung Linguistische Informatik im Forschungsinstitut für deutsche Sprache "Deutscher Sprachatlas" of Marburg's University and forwarded for printing to the IfAG at Frankfurt. In the *groundmap* (I.0) however, for the purpose of readability, the net points with their language codes have been printed in black. Furthermore, in a pocket at the end of the map volume, there is a loose, black and white version of the groundmap which serves a twofold purpose: I) As a sample of the blank maps that can be ordered from the Editorial Secretariat as working maps. II) As an aid to the reader when working with an interpretive map whose symbols might have partly covered the original net points.

13. The circa 2500 points of the ALE net (see further for the list), appear on the maps with their number, accompanied by an abbreviation indicating the language group to which they belong. Here follows the list of the 20 language groups of the groundmap with their respective abbreviation: Abkhazo-Adygei (Ab), Albanian (Al), Arabic (Ar), Baltic (Bl), Basque (Ba), Celtic (C), Finnic (F), Germanic (G), Greek (Gr), Iranian (I), Lapp (L), Mongolian (M), Nakho-Dagestanian (N), Permic (P), Romance (R), Samoyedic (Sa), Slavonic (S), Turkic (T), Ugric (U), Volgaic (V). A 21st language group, namely Romany (French *Tzigane*), does not appear on the groundmap, but only in the interpretive maps, a point to which I return later. Its abbreviation (Tz), however, appears in other parts of the publication.

To show more clearly Europe's great richness in languages and cultures, these 21 language groups can be further clustered in the following 6 families (or superfamilies):

1) Altaic: Mongolian, Turkic.
2) Basque.

3) Caucasian: Abkhazo-Adygei, Nakho-Dagestanian.
4) Indo-European: Albanian, Baltic, Celtic, Germanic, Greek, Indic (Romany), Iranian, Romance, Slavonic.
5) Semitic: Arabic (Maltese).
6) Uralic: Finnic, Lapp, Permic, Samoyedic, Ugric, Volgaic.

Though very incomplete, the abbreviation list on p. XLI gives some idea of the further linguistic subdivision of Europe.

On the whole, the ALE net appears to have little uniformity, with some areas having a high density, and others having a very low one. Unfortunately, this difference is not always justified by a correlation with richness in dialects, but depends on the decentralized and institutional structure of the project, allowing each country to participate on the basis of its own possibilities and criteria. The only fixed principle that was to be followed was a maximal density of one point per 2000 km², a maximum that each country did not need to reach, but depending on dialect differentiation was allowed to place at a lower level. A survey of differences follows, which will begin with the country which has not yet been able to send in its materials, namely Celtic Ireland. We hope to be able to fill this blank spot on our map in the next fascicles, and at the same time to publish supplementary materials for the already published maps and commentaries. As to the other countries: a) In France we see an "open net", that is a subdivision of the area in equal square sections, each containing all net points of the *Atlas Linguistique de la France* (ALF) and of the French regional atlases, out of which the French Committee selects the most relevant answers to each question. This ingenious method has enabled the French Committee to use not only the ALF materials, but also and especially the materials of the French regional atlases, the dense nets of which could not possibly be reproduced on any European map of manageable size. The other relevant materials of each "square" are given in the lists of "double" (i.e. additional) answers. b) Denmark also presents "regions" rather than "points" (v. names in the list of netpoints, further). c) The Nakho-Dagestanian area (28.8/811-836) in the Caucasus is also represented with a method similar to the one used by the French Committee: for, given the great number of languages and dialects in the small area, it would have been impossible to represent them all. In addition to this problem even the ones that have been chosen are crowded into such a small area that it would have been impossible to record them where they actually occur in the map. So these points do not quite correspond to their actual co-ordinates. d) In Finland, there is a double net: 23 points (001-023) for the "simple questions", which will give no variety of answers; 23+134 points (001-023; 101-234) for "complex questions", which yield a variety of different answers. The latter density reaches the recommended maximal average density. The same ingenious method has been adopted for Swedish in Finland (07.5). e) The relatively low density of Poland, the Slavonic area of the USSR, Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia are due to the fact that their materials have been drawn from the results of the OLA, and thus correspond mainly to the OLA net, or to a selection thereof. Among Slavonic countries only Bulgaria has formed its own net differently, namely on the basis of the *Bălgarski Dialekten Atlas* (BDA), the Bulgarian Dialect Atlas. f) The large blank strip that stretches from Crimea to the Ural river depends on the decision taken by the OLA Editors not to record Russian dialects that were not spoken in the area before the 17th century. g) A similar criterion has been adopted in the Netherlands for the Dutch polders, recently claimed from the Zuiderzee, and thus not included in the ALE net. h) In Greece, on the contrary, the dialects of some recently immigrated communities have been recorded, owing to their archaic character (001, 010, 013, 040, 053 and 074). i) Similarly, areas in Poland repopulated after World War II have been included in the ALE net. j) The six Romany points chosen by the International Romany Committee have been recorded in the right lowest corner, since it would have been impossible to place them in their actual coordinates. k) The Italian net (ca. 65 points) is very low in comparison with the richness of its dialects. The Italian Committee has recently agreed to a doubling of the net. The supplementary materials will be published later.

14. The ALE has two different systems of abbreviations, namely: I) The system used for the groundmap, which includes only the above mentioned 20 + 1 language groups and is therefore made of one or two letters. Since this abbreviation system is printed on the groundmap it forms a standard list, in opposition to the second system, which has been established in three different languages. The abbreviation system of the groundmap, however, has been used also in tables and in listings belonging to the commentary volume, wherever it was necessary to refer to the larger linguistic units of the ALE. In the pages following this *Introduction* this list is given separately, to enable the reader to have an overview of the linguistic division of the ALE groundmap. II) The abbreviation system used in legends and commentaries. This second system includes single languages and dialects, subgroups of languages and dialects as well as other references to language areas and therefore makes use of more letters than the first system. As already mentioned, this second system has been established in three languages, namely French, English and German, for authors writing their commentaries in these languages. All legends, however, as well as all lists of *Réponses doubles* (at the end of each commentary), and all *Répertoires classifiés des formes* (at the end of commentaries of motivational maps) make use of the French version of the system. English and German abbreviations are thus only used in the text of English and German commentaries. Hence there is a difference between the

3) Caucasian: Abkhazo-Adygei, Nakho-Dagestanian.
4) Indo-European: Albanian, Baltic, Celtic, Germanic, Greek, Indic (Romany), Iranian, Romance, Slavonic.
5) Semitic: Arabic (Maltese).
6) Uralic: Finnic, Lapp, Permic, Samoyedic, Ugric, Volgaic.

Though very incomplete, the abbreviation list on p. XLI gives some idea of the further linguistic subdivision of Europe.

On the whole, the ALE net appears to have little uniformity, with some areas having a high density, and others having a very low one. Unfortunately, this difference is not always justified by a correlation with richness in dialects, but depends on the decentralized and institutional structure of the project, allowing each country to participate on the basis of its own possibilities and criteria. The only fixed principle that was to be followed was a maximal density of one point per 2000 km², a maximum that each country did not need to reach, but depending on dialect differentiation was allowed to place at a lower level. A survey of differences follows, which will begin with the country which has not yet been able to send in its materials, namely Celtic Ireland. We hope to be able to fill this blank spot on our map in the next fascicles, and at the same time to publish supplementary materials for the already published maps and commentaries. As to the other countries: a) In France we see an "open net", that is a subdivision of the area in equal square sections, each containing all net points of the *Atlas Linguistique de la France* (ALF) and of the French regional atlases, out of which the French Committee selects the most relevant answers to each question. This ingenious method has enabled the French Committee to use not only the ALF materials, but also and especially the materials of the French regional atlases, the dense nets of which could not possibly be reproduced on any European map of manageable size. The other relevant materials of each "square" are given in the lists of "double" (i.e. additional) answers. b) Denmark also presents "regions" rather than "points" (v. names in the list of netpoints, further). c) The Nakho-Dagestanian area (28.8/811-836) in the Caucasus is also represented with a method similar to the one used by the French Committee: for, given the great number of languages and dialects in the small area, it would have been impossible to represent them all. In addition to this problem even the ones that have been chosen are crowded into such a small area that it would have been impossible to record them where they actually occur in the map. So these points do not quite correspond to their actual co-ordinates. d) In Finland, there is a double net: 23 points (001-023) for the "simple questions", which will give no variety of answers; 23 + 134 points (001-023; 101-234) for "complex questions", which yield a variety of different answers. The latter density reaches the recommended maximal average density. The same ingenious method has been adopted for Swedish in Finland (07.5). e) The relatively low density of Poland, the Slavonic area of the USSR, Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia are due to the fact that their materials have been drawn from the results of the OLA, and thus correspond mainly to the OLA net, or to a selection thereof. Among Slavonic countries only Bulgaria has formed its own net differently, namely on the basis of the *Bălgarski Dialekten Atlas* (BDA), the Bulgarian Dialect Atlas. f) The large blank strip that stretches from Crimea to the Ural river depends on the decision taken by the OLA Editors not to record Russian dialects that were not spoken in the area before the 17th century. g) A similar criterion has been adopted in the Netherlands for the Dutch polders, recently claimed from the Zuiderzee, and thus not included in the ALE net. h) In Greece, on the contrary, the dialects of some recently immigrated communities have been recorded, owing to their archaic character (001, 010, 013, 040, 053 and 074). i) Similarly, areas in Poland repopulated after World War II have been included in the ALE net. j) The six Romany points chosen by the International Romany Committee have been recorded in the right lowest corner, since it would have been impossible to place them in their actual coordinates. k) The Italian net (ca. 65 points) is very low in comparison with the richness of its dialects. The Italian Committee has recently agreed to a doubling of the net. The supplementary materials will be published later.

14. The ALE has two different systems of abbreviations, namely: I) The system used for the groundmap, which includes only the above mentioned 20 + 1 language groups and is therefore made of one or two letters. Since this abbreviation system is printed on the groundmap it forms a standard list, in opposition to the second system, which has been established in three different languages. The abbreviation system of the groundmap, however, has been used also in tables and in listings belonging to the commentary volume, wherever it was necessary to refer to the larger linguistic units of the ALE. In the pages following this *Introduction* this list is given separately, to enable the reader to have an overview of the linguistic division of the ALE groundmap. II) The abbreviation system used in legends and commentaries. This second system includes single languages and dialects, subgroups of languages and dialects as well as other references to language areas and therefore makes use of more letters than the first system. As already mentioned, this second system has been established in three languages, namely French, English and German, for authors writing their commentaries in these languages. All legends, however, as well as all lists of *Réponses doubles* (at the end of each commentary), and all *Répertoires classifiés des formes* (at the end of commentaries of motivational maps) make use of the French version of the system. English and German abbreviations are thus only used in the text of English and German commentaries. Hence there is a difference between the

three lists representing the second system of abbreviations: only the French can be considered as the master list, including as it does also the abbreviations of the first system. The reader of any English or German commentary must in fact always make use of the French list of abbreviations for interpreting a legend, a list of *Réponses doubles* or a *Répertoire classifié des formes* belonging to a motivational map. In all abbreviation lists of the second system, however, the names of languages and dialects belonging to the ALE groundmap are followed by the abbreviation of the first system, indicating the language group to which they belong.

There remains to be said that in these first fascicles of maps and commentaries the proliferation of abbreviations for the same concepts, a result of the use of too many different systems in the previous stages of the project, could be eliminated only partially.

15. National Committees have also used different methods as far as the collection of their materials is concerned; a representative survey follows. Basically, three different methods have been followed, often in combination with one another: I. New fieldwork; II. Published sources; III. Unpublished archives.

I. New fieldwork for the ALE has been done in the following countries: Albania, for Albanian; Austria, for Slavonic; Belgium, for Dutch and Walloon; Bulgaria, for Bulgarian, Czechoslovakia, for Hungarian; Finland (for the greatest part, v. further), for Lapp; France, for Corsican, Breton and Basque; the German Democratic Republic (partly) for High and Low German, and Sorbian; the German Federal Republic, for High and Low German, and Frisian; Great Britain, for English, Welsh, Scots and Gaelic; Greece, for Greek; Hungary, for new questions and for alloglot points; Iceland, for Icelandic; Ireland, for Irish and English; Luxemburg, for Luxemburgian; the Netherlands, for Dutch and Frisian; Norway, for Norwegian (supplemented by published sources, v. further) and Lapp (fieldwork for Finnish has been done by Finland); Portugal, for Portuguese; Rumania, for Rumanian and alloglot points; Spain, for Spanish and for Catalan; Sweden and Norway, for Finnish (except for two points, v. further; the fieldwork has been done by Finland) and Lapp; Switzerland, for Swiss German; Turkey, for European Turkish; the USSR, for most of the Lettonian materials (v. further), for Lapp, for Karelian, for Vepsian, for Finnish, for Livonian, partly for Votic (v. further), for most of the Ingrian materials (v. further), for Mordvin, for Mari, for Udmurt, for Komi-Permyak (along with previous fieldwork), for Komi-Zyrian, for Nenets, for Hungarian, for Moldavian, for Ossetic, for Tat, for Adygei, for Chechen and Ingush, for Abazin (and the other Nakho-Dagestanian languages), for Chuvash, for Karachay-Balkar, for Nogai, for Bashkir, for Tatar (also using previous fieldwork and archives, v. further), for Karaim, for Kumyk and for Kalmyc; Yugoslavia, for Albanian, Hungarian, Italian and Rumanian; Cyprus for Greek; the Faroe Islands for Faroese; and finally for the six points of Romany.

This survey of fieldwork shows, perhaps better than any description, the impressive investments made by European countries participating in the ALE, in particular by the USSR, as well as the amount of original work that will go into ALE maps, into ALE publication of raw materials, and into ALE archives that will be available for future use.

II. Primary use of published sources has been made in several countries. A survey follows: in France, the ALF and the series of the French regional atlases, as well as their archives for those not yet published. In Hungary, the *A magyar nyelvjárások atlasza* (plus fieldwork for new questions, and for alloglot points, see above). In Italy, the *Sprach- und Sachatlas Italiens und der Südschweiz* (AIS) and the archives of the yet unpublished *Atlante Linguistico Italiano* (ALI) in Torino (plus one field-investigation). In Sweden, Grundström, Schlachter and Hasselbrink, as well as the Uppsala archives have been used for Lapp. In Rhaeto-Romance Switzerland, the AIS and the archives of the *Dicziunari Rumantsch Grischun* (DRG) at Chur.

On secondary use of published sources we cannot offer a complete survey. Explicit information about it has been given us by the following countries: the Estonian SSR, for Ingrian (Nirvi, as supplement to field work); Finland, for one Lapp point (Itkonen-WKKL); the Lettonian SSR, for Lettonian (Miltenbahs-Endzelins and Endzelins-Hauzenberga, as supplements to field work); Norway, for Norwegian (Arbo Høegh (1974), Larsen (1926), Venås (1977), Bjørkum (1974), Hunstadbråten (1973), Vidsteen (1900), supplementary to the above mentioned field investigations).

III. Archives that have been used as primary sources are: those of the Institut for dansk Dialektforskning of Copenhagen and of the Institut for jysk sprog- og kulturforskning of Århus, for Danish; those of the Academy of Sciences of the Estonian SSR (for Estonian and Votic; for the latter also new field work was made: v. above); those of the Kotimaisten kielten tutkimuskeskus (Research Center of Finland's Domestic Languages) and of the University of Helsinki for Finnish and the Swedish dialects of Finland (for Finnish, also new materials were collected by means of questionnaires which were addressed to a network of voluntary correspondents); for two Finnish dialects in Sweden (Östmark, Tärändö) the archives of the Kotimaisten kielten tutkimuskeskus have been used, while the bulk of information on Finnish in Sweden has been obtained by means of new fieldwork (s. above); the archives of Uppsala, Lund, Gothenburg and Umeå for Swedish, those of Uppsala for Lapp; those of the Academy of Sciences of the Lettonian SSR for Lettonian, and of the Academy of the Lithuanian SSR for Lithuanian; the archives of the Norsk Målførearkiv, University of Oslo, and those of the

Nordisk Institutt of Trondheim and Bergen (supplement to fieldwork), for Norwegian; the archives of the Saxonian Academy of Sciences in Leipzig for the Saxonian dialects; the archives of the OLA for the different Slavonic languages and dialects, located in the Academies of Sciences of the USSR and of the Belorussian and Ukrainian SSRs, for Russian, Belorussian and Ukrainian; in the Academies of Sciences of the different Socialist countries (Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Poland), for Bulgarian, Czech, Slovak and Polish; of the different Socialist Republics of Yugoslavia for Serbocroatian, Slovenian and Macedonian. The archives of the *Glossaire des Patois de la Suisse Romande* (GPSR) at Neuchâtel were used for Swiss French.

16. As is known, it is possible that for the same question of a questionnaire more than one answer is given: in most cases two, but in certain cases (as is the case of the rainbow, for example) as many as five. In such cases the author of a map and its commentary must make a choice as to which answer must appear on the map, and which in the lists of additional ("double") answers. The Editorial Board has determined the following criteria for the choice between different answers: A) A word with a narrower distribution has priority over a word with a larger distribution. B) A regressive word has priority over a word in expansion. C) An earlier word has priority over a more recent one. D) A word with clear dialect character has priority over a word belonging to the standard language. In most cases these criteria overlap. When they contradict one another, national committees take the decision. Occasionally, solutions can be found which are not in full accordance with the criteria. On maps, a small "2" above and to the right of the symbol indicates that on this point one or more answers can be found in the appropriate list given at the end of each commentary.

As already said, the lists of *Réponses doubles* include references to the etymological analysis of legends, indicated by means of the same numbering.

17. In the legends and in the commentaries, a distinction has been introduced between *orthographic forms*, printed in italics, and *reference forms*, printed between "[ ]" signs. The former represent the simplest and most immediate level of abstraction that reduces dialect forms to existing standard words (or transposes them to potential standard forms; often orthographic forms are identical with lemmata to be found in standard dialect dictionaries); the latter are dialect words that cannot be reduced to standard words, and thus are retained in their original forms. It must be clear that orthographic forms represent the most obvious etymological interpretation of dialect materials within national frontiers and not "real" standard words. Both orthographic and reference forms thus represent dialect materials, the only difference being that only the first have an equivalent in (or can be transposed into) the national standard language. Thus the orthographic forms have also a practical

function: they indicate that they can be found in standard dictionaries (and other commonly used sources).

18. Finally I must mention that the Bulgarian National Committee has recently decided to withdraw from the ALE (as from the OLA).

19. In the following pages, before a short description of the activities of Marburg's Abteilung Linguistische Informatik by Putschke and Neumann, information follows that will help the atlas user, providing i) Four lists of abbreviations, namely: A) The first system of abbreviations, i.e. those used mainly on the groundmap, with their full forms in three languages; B) The French, all-comprehensive list of abbreviations, including both the second system of abbreviations (i.e. those used in legends and listings) and the first; C) The English and D) German second system of abbreviations; ii) A table in which each country appears with its own code number, name and netpoints, the last with their numbers and language-group membership; iii) The net-points of the ALE; iv) The phonetic notation; v) The transliteration systems. After Putschke and Neumann's contribution (vi), an organogram of the ALE (vii) concludes the introductory part of this volume.

20. Summarizing: we hope that the ALE will contribute towards the progress of linguistic geography and linguistic history, in particular in the following areas: A) The study of semantic motivations, in the framework of a cultural universal typology, and as a new methodology for large scale geolinguistic, comparative projects. B) The study of languages in contact, and especially of language groups and families in contact, seen in the context of a large area, where several language groups and families have formed an intricate mosaic, with yet unused possibilities for crossdating. C) A better framework and a stimulus for studies of the relationship between language and culture. D) The study of those isoglosses that continue beyond language groups and families. E) An inspiration for the realization of better projects of a similar kind, and especially of atlases of language groups, now perhaps one of the most urgent tasks of linguistic geography.

Personally, I would like to add, as a final wish, that the ALE will not only realize the possibility of international scientific co-operation on a large scale, but that it will also help promote and increase a similar spirit of co-operation in every possible other form, as an indispensable part of human endeavour towards peace, mutual understanding and friendship among the nations: a goal that may not only make science more human, but also human and international relationships more scientific*.

MARIO ALINEI

* I would like to thank Terho Itkonen, V. V. Ivanov, Pavle Ivić, Mieczysław Szymczak, Toon Weijnen and Joep Kruijsen for their kind and useful suggestions concerning this *Introduction*. Bibliographic references are found at the end of this volume.

09.0 GB-Angleterre (G.2)

001 Thropton
002 Brigham
003 Abbeytown
004 Staveley-in-Kendal
005 Great Strickland
006 Allendale
007 Muker
008 Witton-le-Wear
009 Skelton
010 Pilling
011 Kingsley
012 Audlem
013 Harwood
014 Mow Cop
015 Golcar
016 Bamford
017 Kniveton
018 Tickhill
019 Oxton
020 York
021 Keelby
022 Welwick
023 Clun
024 Weobley
025 Kinnersley
026 Clifton on Teme
027 Lapley
028 Bretforton
029 Nether Whitacre
030 Napton-on-the-Hill
031 Ullesthorpe
032 Hathern
033 Little Harrowden
034 Turvey
035 Swinstead
036 Warboys
037 Kedington
038 Docking
039 Mendlesham
040 Ashwellthorpe
041 Swimbridge
042 Brompton Regis
043 Raglan
044 Wedmore
045 Whitchurch
046 Latteridge
047 Avebury
048 Sherborne
049 Steeple Aston
050 Alresford
051 Cuxham
052 Sutton
053 East Clandon
054 Codicote
055 Fletching
056 Little Baddow
057 Warren Street
058 Little Bentley
059 Staple
060 St. Ewe
061 Altarnun
062 South Zeal
063 Ansty
064 Kingston
065 Whiteparish
066 Grimston

09.1 GB-Pays de Galles (C.6/G.2)

101 Trefor (Anglesey) **C.6**
102 Llanfair Tallhaiarn (Denbighshire) **G.2**
103 Buckley (Flintshire) **G.2**
104 Boncath (Pembrokeshire) **G.2**
105 Mellteyrn (Caernarfonshire) **C.6**
106 Llanddwywe (Merioneth) **C.6**
107 Llanrhystyd (Cardiganshire) **C.6**
108 Llansawel (Carmarthenshire) **C.6**
109 Llanbister (Radnorshire) **G.2**
110 Painscastle (Radnorshire) **G.2**
111 Four Crosses (Montgomeryshire) **G.2**
112 Marloes (Pembrokeshire) **G.2**
113 Llangennith (Glamorganshire) **G.2**
114 Penderyn (Breconshire) **G.2**
115 Peterston-super-Ely (Glamorganshire) **G.2**
116 Usk (Monmouthshire) **G.2**

09.2 GB-Écosse

a. points anglais (**G.2**)
201 John O'Groats
202 Elgin
203 Huntly
204 Lumphanan
205 Rosehearty
206 Denny
207 Crieff
208 Cupar
209 Brechin
210 Kilmarnock
211 Carnwath
212 Earlston
213 Innerwick
214 Stranraer
215 Castle Douglas

b. points gaéliques[11] (**C.6**)
216 Brue (Lewis)
217 Assynt (W.-Sutherland)
218 Uriskay
219 Borgabost (Harris)
220 Uig (N.-Skye)
221 Camus Cross (S.-Skye)
222 Killin (Perthshire)
223 Lochgair (Argillshire)
224 Golspie (E.-Sutherland)
225 Isle of Man

09.3 GB-Irlande du Nord[12] (G.2)

301 Glarryford (Co. Antrim)
302 Plumbridge (Co. Tyrone)
303 Benburb (Co. Tyrone)
304 Ballygalget (Co. Down)

10.0 GRÈCE (Gr.6)

001 Rodópolis
002 Toxotes
003 Kósmion
004 Soufli
005 Orestiás
006 Kómitsa
007 Kastoriá
008 Siátista
009 Náousa
010 Aridaía
011 Katafygi
012 Meliki
013 Polýkastro
014 Epanomí
015 Nigrita
016 Arnaía
017 Mesoropi
018 Samothráki
019 Karousades
020 Paramythiá
021 Louros
022 Kalendzi
023 Peta
024 Rízoma
025 Vemvakoú
026 Karyá
027 Melivoia
028 Almyrós
029 Tsangaranda
030 Thanos
031 Sami
032 Sparton
033 Neochori
034 Thermon
035 Karpenisi
036 Lidoríki
037 Stylis
038 Livadiá
039 Aidipsós
040 Nea Artaki
041 Kymi
042 Kárystos
043 Skyros
044 Pyrgi
045 Plomari
046 Machairado
047 Gastouní
048 Kértezi
049 Valtessinico
050 Meropi
051 Trikala
052 Tyros
053 Nea Kios
054 Mégara
055 Athinai
056 Kythnos
057 Mýkonos
058 Apýranthos
059 Raches
060 Karlóvasi
061 Pylos
062 Kardamyli
063 Kitta
064 Geraki
065 Ágios Nikólaos
066 Potamós
067 Milos
068 Pyrgos
069 Pyli
070 Mesanagrós
071 Elos
072 Kalikratis
073 Anogia
074 Nea Alikarnasós
075 Pyrgos
076 Mochós
077 Pano Chariò
078[13] Menetès

[11] Dans les listings des matériaux les points gaéliques de l'Écosse se trouvent sous un en-tête propre: 09.3.
[12] Les points anglais de l'Irlande-du-Nord se trouvent sous 12.1 (Irlande, anglais) dans les listings des matériaux (12.1/301-304).
[13] Dans les listings des matériaux le réseau grec est élargi par les points 501 et 502 du grec en Italie (14.5/501, 502) et par le point 511 du grec de Corse (08.5/511).